

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 8 and 10 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended by this response. Claims 3, 5, 6 and 9 are cancelled by this response. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

**Rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph**

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as not complying with the written description requirement. Specifically, claim 10 was rejected as including subject matter not described in the specification. In accordance with the comments in the Office Action, Claim 10 has been amended to refer to an MPEG encoder and MPEG decoder. In view of the amendments to claim 10, it is respectfully submitted that claim 10 is fully described in the specification and this rejection should be withdrawn.

**Rejection of claims 1-5 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

Claims 1-5 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Cho (U.S. Patent No. 5,680,176) in view of Chin et al. (EP1128637) and further in view of Carlsgaard et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/086320).

Applicant submits that contrary to the rejection under 35 USC 102(b) in the office action, the intended rejection of claims 1-5 and 7-9 is under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Cho in view of Chin et al. and further in view of Carlsgaard et al.

Claim 6 was indicated as allowable. Claim 1 has been amended to include the features of claims 3, 5 and 6 and thus is likewise allowable. Claims 3-6 have been cancelled. Claims 2, 7 and 8 are dependent on claim 1 and thus are also allowable. Claim 9 has been cancelled.

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the Office Action fails to make a prima facie case that claims 1-5 and 7-9 are unpatentable in view of Cho, Chin et al. and/or Carlsgaard et al. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections, it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at the phone number below, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,  
Frank Dumont et al.

By: 

Jack Schwartz  
Reg. No. 34,721

Patent Operations  
Thomson Licensing, LLC  
P.O. Box 5312,  
Princeton, NJ 08543-0028  
July 20, 2010